



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,401	09/23/2003	Gerald Altman	5957-72402	9364
35690	7590	11/29/2010		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/29/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent\_docketing@intprop.com  
ptomhkkg@gmail.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/667,401	ALTMAN, GERALD
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2010.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-30,33,35,36,41-45,48-54,56-63,65-72 and 76-79 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24-30,33,35,36,41-45,48-54,56-63,65-72 and 76-79 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/10.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Communication is in response to the Amendment filed 30 August 2010.
2. Claims 24-30, 33, 35, 36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79 are currently pending. In the Amendment filed 30 August 2010, none of the claims are amended. This action is made Non-Final.
3. The previously presented prior art rejections have been withdrawn.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 August 2010 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***35 USC § 101 - Clarifications***

5. It is noted that the claimed computer readable memory medium is considered to be represented by the disclosed computer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 24-30, 33, 35-36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,427,032 to Irons et al (hereafter Irons) in view of US Patent 5,557,512 to Vanko et al (hereafter Vanko) in view of US Patent No 5,615,367 to Bennett et al (hereafter Bennett).**

**Referring to claim 24**, Irons discloses a method, comprising:

receiving a succession of electronic documents into a computer document management system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time [scanning or imaging the documents] (see column 7, lines 52-67); and

for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents:

the computer system generating a corresponding unique identifier [globally unique identifier] (see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48); and

the computer system storing, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document [meta-data] in each of a plurality of tables [indexes – the multiple indexes are considered to represent a

plurality of tables] accessible to the computer system, wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes the generated unique identifier [unique global identifier] as one of its respective plurality of attributes, and wherein the generated unique identifier is usable to access each of the plurality of tables [the globally unique document identifier is used to effectively link the document image to the record in the database, facilitating later retrieval of the document image, typically via the indexes], and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41); and

the computer system accessing the plurality of attributes [meta-data] for the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding unique identifier [globally unique identifier] for the electronic document (see column 6, lines 42-58 and column 8, lines 30-49).

While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents, Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the computer system wherein unique time-based identifier identifies a date and time of day corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received by the computer system. Vanko discloses an electronic system for data entry (see abstract), including the further limitation of the computer system generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier identifying a date and time of day

that the electronic document was received by the computer system [the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The combination of Irons and Vanko (hereafter Irons/Vanko) fails to explicitly disclose that the database is a relational database. Bennett discloses the management of data, including the further limitation of the use of a relational database (see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a relational database of Bennett as the storage mechanism of Irons/Vanko. One would have been motivated to do so since a relational database is an SQL compatible database and according to Irons, the repository may be a SQL compatible database (see column 11, lines 45-59).

**Referring to claims 41, 48 and 56**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 24.

**Referring to claim 25**, the combination of Irons/Vanko and Bennett (hereafter Irons/Vanko/Bennett) discloses the method of claim 24, wherein, for a given electronic document received by the computer system: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to an entity originating the given electronic document; and a second of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see column 6, lines 25-58 and Bennett: column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

**Referring to claims 43, 50, 51, 52 and 61**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 25.

**Referring to claim 26**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 25, wherein a date and time of day at which a given electronic documents is received by the computer system corresponds to a date and time of day at which the first electronic document was created by imaging a physical document [the moment the OUTPUT button was activated] (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5 and Irons: see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48).

**Referring to claim 49**, the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 26.

**Referring to claim 27**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising the computer system retrieving a given electronic document in the succession of electronic documents from the electronic storage

using the corresponding unique time-based identifier for the given electronic document; and wherein the time of day is specified by at least an hour value, a minutes value, and a seconds value (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

**Referring to claims 60 and 66-68**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 27.

**Referring to claim 28**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24, wherein said receiving includes: receiving imaged electronic documents (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-61); and/or receiving computer generated electronic documents (Irons: see column 7, lines 62-64).

**Referring to claims 45, 58, 59 and 65**, the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 28.

**Referring to claim 29**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the imaged electronic documents include electronic documents that were created by imaging corresponding physical documents, wherein each corresponding physical document is marked with the corresponding unique time-based identifier after said imaging [prints and applies a label directly onto the paper-based document] (Irons: see column 13, lines 1-16).

**Referring to claim 30**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the computer generated electronic documents include electronic documents received from one or more of the following sources: word processing programs, graphics programs, e-mail, facsimile transmissions [e-mail] (Irons: see column 7, lines 52-67).

**Referring to claim 33**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24, further comprising: accessing a first electronic document stored in the storage system using a first unique time-based identifier, wherein the first unique time-based identifier corresponds to a first date and point in time of day when the first electronic document was received into the document management system [the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

**Referring to claims 42 and 57**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 33.

**Referring to claim 35**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 25, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given electronic document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical

document (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

**Referring to claims 43, 53 and 62**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 35.

**Referring to claim 36**, Irons/Green/Payne discloses the method of claim 35, wherein a fifth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

**Referring to claims 44, 54, 63 and 69-72**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 36.

**Referring to claim 76**, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24, wherein a first of the plurality of tables includes the unique time-based identifier as an attribute, and wherein the first table is accessible using the unique time-based identifier as a primary key of the first table (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Bennett: see column 9, line 48-67).

**Referring to claims 77-79**, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 76.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Referring to Applicant's argument on pages 15-16 of the Remarks with regards to the argument that Irons is not prior art, the Examiner has now presented the rejections of the claims utilizing the parent application as requested by the Applicant.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to the limitation of the unique time-based identifier identifying a time and a date on pages 17-18 of the Remarks have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 19 of the Remarks with regards to the limitation of using the identifier to access each of the plurality of tables, the examiner respectfully disagrees that the rejection presented above fails to disclose this limitation. It is noted that in the arguments presented 30 March 2010, the Applicant argues that support for this limitation can be found through the use of the primary and secondary keys. The examiner notes that this type of access is inherent in the use of a relational database. If the Applicant is interpreting this limitation in the manner that each table can be accessed utilizing the time/date identifier due to the fact that each table has a field for the time/date identifier, the priority date of the present application would be 9/23/2003 since none of the applications to which the present application claims priority to discloses that each of the tables has a time/date field.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No 7,720,805 to Martin, Jr titled "Sequential Upload Processing of IMS Databases"
- US Patent No 5,666,490 to Gillings et al
- US Patent No 5,344,132 to LeBrun et al

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Application/Control Number: 10/667,401  
Art Unit: 2167

Page 13